

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims were amended by rewriting claims 8, 9, 40, 49, 57 and 73 and 80 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 3-5, 8-11, 13, 14, 15, 17-19, 34, 36-39, 40, 42-48, 49, 52, 54-60, 71, 73 and 75-80 remain in the application. Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Allowed Claims

Claims 3-5, 11, 13-15, 17-19, 34-36-39, 52, 54-56, 59, 60, 71 and 79 are allowed over the prior art.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowed subject matter.

Claim Objections:

The Examiner indicated that claims 40, 49, 57 and 73 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome claim objections noted by the Examiner.

a. Claim 40

Applicants have amended claim 40 to overcome the antecedent basis objection by changing the limitation of $C_{ja}(t)$ to $C_{jc}(t)$ per the Examiner's suggestion.

b. Claim 40

Applicants have further amended claim 40 to overcome a second antecedent basis objection by aligning the term $F_{out}(t)$ with the language used in dependent claims 45 and 46. Claim 40 is now in condition for allowance.

c. Claim 49

Applicants have amended claim 49 to overcome the clarity objection per the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 49 is now in condition for allowance.

d. Claim 57

Applicants have amended claim 57 to overcome the antecedent basis objection noted by the Examiner by removing the term C_{La} such that the claim now reads: “the first and second multiplexers are connected to the tap outputs in a manner such that a tap address C_{La} from the sequence of tap addresses selects...”. Claim 57 is now in condition for allowance.

e. Claim 73

Applicants have amended claim 73 to overcome the antecedent basis objection by changing the limitation of $C_{ja}(t)$ to $C_{jc}(t)$ per the Examiner’s suggestion. Claim 73 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 8, 9 and 80 were rejected under 35 USC112, first and second paragraph.

Claims 8 and 9

Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to “route the selected second set of the plurality of selected tap outputs to ~~the~~ another common node to produce the second output signal.” The claimed limitation now matches FIGs. 4 and 6 of the specification. Hence the rejection of claims 8 and 9, as amended, is overcome.

Claims 80

Claim 80 was amended to correct the algorithm selection for P and P+1 (these were flipped). Support for this amendment is found on page 7, lines 16-17. The algorithm selects the value of P for 1-0.Q operational cycles and selects the value of P+1 for 0.Q operational cycles.

Applicant will also run through the example discussed in the spec described on page 7, lines 6-19:

For a tap selection of 6.4

- we get $P=6$ and $Q=4$
- for the $P=6$ case, where $P=1-0.Q$
- we have $1-0.4 = 0.6$
- then for 10 cycles we have $0.6 \times 10 \text{ cycles} = 6$
- thus, we pick the 6 tap 6 times

For the $P=7$ case, where $P=0.Q$

- we have $0.Q=0.4$
- then for 10 cycles we have $0.4 \times 10 = 4$
- thus, we pick the 7 tap 4 times

Another way of looking at this is to say that:

60% of the time Tap 6 is selected; and

40% of the time Tap 7 is selected.

The goal/result is to have an average tap selection of 6.4

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 80, as amended, is overcome.

Accordingly, claims 8, 9, 10, 79, 80, 34, 40, 71, 73, 36-39, 42-48, 57, 58, 75-78 are all believed to be in condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

May 25, 2006

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/
Barbara R. Doutre
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 39,505
Tel. No: 954-723-6449
Fax No.: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com